

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim 11 has been objected to due to the redundant recitation of “portable.” Appropriate correction has been made to claim 11.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kamepalli. Applicants respectfully traverse.

With respect to claim 1, Applicants claim an electronic system including a portable host device and an expansion module. The Examiner cites to the computer system 101 and multifunction device 121 as meeting these limitations. Claim 1 further recites that the expansion module includes a number of components. Among the included components within the module is a re-configurable unit adapted to be circuit modified to establish connections within the module, implement a certain class of functions, and control the module components to support the implemented class of functions. The Examiner cites to the computer system 101 of Kamepalli as meeting this limitation. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this analysis and asserts that the re-configurable unit of claim 1 is a part of the expansion module itself. The citation to the computer system 101 of Kamepalli (i.e., the portable host) is therefore not relevant to the claimed invention. If the Examiner is relying on the multifunction device 121 as meeting the expansion module limitation, then the claimed re-configurable unit must be located within the multifunction device 121 itself. The Examiner has failed to show how the multifunction device 121 of Kamepalli includes a re-configurable unit as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully traverse the Section 102 anticipation rejection as the cited Kamepalli reference fails to teach or suggest the claimed re-configurable unit.

Applicants make a similar argument with respect to the claimed software algorithm. Again, this algorithm is recited as being part of the expansion module. The Examiner, however, cites to a BIOS routine as meeting this limitation. Such routines, however, are clearly taught in Kamepalli as being located within and executed by the computer system 101 and are not located in the multifunction device 121 (i.e., the claimed module). Withdrawal of the Section 102 anticipation rejection is accordingly requested.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that the re-configurable unit operates to be circuit modified to establish connections within the module, implement a certain class of functions, and control the module components to support the implemented class of functions. There is no teaching or suggestion that such circuit modifications are implemented within the multifunction device 121 of Kamepalli to support functional selection. These circuit modifications enable the module to be dynamically, as opposed to statically, configured, as will be discussed in more detail below.

Applicants further have amended claim 1 to clarify that the control device within the module operates to control the circuit modification of the reconfigurable unit to support the implemented class of functions. The Examiner cites to the control logic 207 of the multifunction device 121 of Kamepalli as meeting this limitation. However, it is clear that the control logic 207 does nothing more than control the writing of enable/disable configuration data into a plurality of registers within the device 121. This configuration data specifies whether a given

function within the device 121 is enabled or disabled. It does not, however, control the reconfiguration of the device 121 from a circuit modification perspective (as claimed) to support functions.

It is accordingly noted that there is a clear distinction between the static operation of the Kamepalli device 121 and the dynamic operation of the claimed module. In Kamepalli, the device 121 is hard or statically designed to support certain functions (f0-f7, for example). Whether these functions are on (i.e., enabled) or off (i.e., disabled) is determined by writing a logic 1 or logic 0, respectively, into the control registers. The control logic 207 merely manages turning these functions on and off as needed. In the claimed invention, however, a much more sophisticated and dynamic functional configuration operation is supported. A number of peripherals are provided on the module. These peripherals may be used in any of a number of ways, and in various combinations, to serve different classes of functions. The claimed reconfigurable unit operates to be circuit modified as directed in order to dynamically implement one or more classes of functions. The operation occurs at the direction of the control device, responsive to the software algorithm, using the circuit configuration information stored in the non-volatile memory. Thus, as stated in the specification, the claimed invention differs from the prior art like Kamepalli which provides “a mere aggregate of wired functions from which the user is prompted to make his/her choice” and instead provides “a series of peripherals and (at least one) set of reconfigurable blocks which modify the system hardware to produce a desired function, irrespective of whether the desired function is pre-defined in the board 15 or is requested at run-time.” Specification, page 7, lines 9-16. There is no teaching or suggestion in

CUSTOMER NO. 23932

PATENT APPLICATION
Docket No. 61181-3uspx

Kamepalli for the claimed device or for the claimed device operation with respect to circuit configuring the module to support at least one of the classes of functions. Withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection is accordingly requested.

Claim 11 is asserted to distinguish over the prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Turning now to claim 2, Applicants have amended this claim to emphasize that a circuit reconfiguring is performed in the expansion module to provide the new function requested. As discussed above, Kamepalli simply notes in a registry whether a statically available function is turned on or off. There is no action taken in Kamepalli to perform circuit reconfiguration in dynamic support of the new function. Withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection is accordingly requested.

In view of the above, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, P.C.

Andre M. Szuwalski
Registration No. 35,701

Date: 12/16/04

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200
Dallas, Texas 75202-2799
(Direct) 214/855-4795
(Fax) 214/855-4300